DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 346 543 EA 021 714

AUTHOR Marshall, Catherine
TITLE Educational Policy Dilemmas: Can We Have Control and Quality and Choice and Democracy and Equity?
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 32p.; In: Borman, Ed. Contemporary Issues in Education. Norwood, NJ, Ablex Publishing Corporation, 1990. Chapter 1.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Administration; *Educational Change; *Educational Policy; Educational Practices; Elementary Secondary Education; *Equal Education; *Outcomes of Education; Role of Education

ABSTRACT

Educational managers, policymakers, and scholars should make a courageous effort to face fundamental school system policymaking dilemmas in new ways. Self-empowering strategies are the levers that uncover, clarify, and solve problems. This paper argues that qualitative research, as a self-empowering problem solving strategy, will enable educators and researchers to explore beyond the limits of current theory and practice and make meaning of observed patterns of behavior in order to promote control, quality, choice, democracy, and equity in educational policy and management. Fundamental policymaking dilemmas include the following: (1) the basic values (equity, quality, choice and efficiency) are often in conflict; (2) the definition of "quality education" is culture laden; (3) teaching about equity, choice, and diversity requires confronting the schools' role in producing society's underclass; and (4) insider and outsider pressures are required to change the system. A detailed exploration of possible solutions to these dilemmas is provided. (JAM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED346543

Educational Policy Dilemmas: Can We Have Control and Quality and Choice and Democracy and Equity?

Catherine Marshall

Peabody College of
Vanderbilt University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Barbara Bernstein

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

EA 021 714

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Educational Policy Dilemmas: Can We Have Control and Quality and Choice and Democracy and Equity?

There are signs of bad times in educational policy making at all levels: local, state and federal. At the local level superintendents are finding that they can no longer rely on the government's mantle for legitimacy. Good interpersonal skills are not enough to create faith in public education (Fleming, 1988). But there is something in the nature of educational policy making that mitigates against valuing diversity or equity. (Sarason, 1982; Blietz and Courtnage, 1980; and Cline, 1981). Additionally, in the daily work of administration at the school level there is a tendency for principals' behaviors to be "variety-reducing" (Wolcott, 1973), where "their attention was directed at keeping things 'manageable' by drawing upon and reinforcing the existing system rather than by nurturing or even permitting the introduction of variation" (p. 403). Such behavior appears to keep the system performing adequately and in control. The only changes tolerated are within-system changes--those that do not interfere with established administrative procedures or power alliances (Barnhart, 1986).

But schools are facing a decline of credibility and legitimacy (Boyd, 1983; Habermas, 1976) and, stricter regulation. At the university level, professors and researchers argue with each other over how we know what we know (see, for example, Gronn, 1983), and university departments cannot decide whether to provide administrative tools to practitioners or to offer doctorates (National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration, 1987).

State policy makers have tightened control by defining what teachers need and what constitutes quality education (Wise, 1979). This is not a climate wherein educators will engage in questioning, critical self-analysis, wide searches for options, and creative problem solving. And, in their efforts to

respond to the demands for higher quality, policy makers have ignored equity concerns. Many states' increased curriculum standards, student competency exams, and graduation requirements leave lower achieving students, often from lower SES backgrounds, in the lurch. And many of the efforts to improve the quality of administrators' training have ignored the fact that administration is primarily the domain of white males (Ortiz and Marshall, 1988; Murphy and Hallinger, 1987; Sadker and Sadker, 1988).

This chapter argues for educational managers, policy makers, and scholars to make a courageous effort to face fundamental dilemmas in the school system in new ways. It describes levers which can be used to do critical self-analysis to uncover, face, and work to clarify the dilemmas, and to seek empowering strategies for wider involvement in defining problems and in decisionmaking.

Educators can work in collaboration with researchers to systematically analyze the recurrent patterns in school life. This chapter shows how qualitative research will enable these collaborators to explore beyond the limits of extant theory and practice and uncover the ways various participants in schools make meaning of the patterns observed. Close observation and analysis of the use of language can be a tool for identifying the dominant "story" and then focusing on how leading actors create that story and how the story and the assumptions, policies, and practices that flow from that model of life differentially affect members of schools.

Also, as educators learn the skills of observation and critical analysis of recurring events in schools, they will be better able to gather data and articulate positions as participants in decisionmaking. The process of problem-defining, searching for options, and choosing best alternatives will be enlivened by empowered educators and community members.

Finally, the perspectives of critical policy analysis will enable educational managers to view school structure and policy in the context of history and cultural politics. Administrators and other policy actors will be forced to recognize that every decision is an authoritative allocation of values and to recognize and place credence in multiple approaches to evaluating the policies and the multiple interpretations that emanate from different views of reality.

This chapter promotes the use of tools of observation, politicization, and training for a model of administration and policy making that honestly searches for understanding by facing the fundamental dilemmas inherent in our educational system. The chapter first describes the limitations of old ways of analyzing and managing the policy process in education, then describes the fundamental dilemmas, and finally proposes a set of levers for uncovering new ways of analyzing schools.

Fundamental Dilemmas in Educational Policy and Management

There are four dilemmas that, no matter how they are side stepped, persistently spring back to challenge educational policy making.

Fundamental Dilemma #1: Basic Values are Opposing

It is hard to pursue equity, quality, choice, and efficiency values all at once. U.S. education policy history shows that different eras have emphasized one or another of these values. When policy makers were concerned about the masses of uneducated immigrants entering the United States, they supported policies to set up an efficient public school system (Tyack, 1974; Katz, 1971). When policy actors saw the Russians moving ahead of the U.S. in science, they were propelled into national programs to raise the quality of the curriculum. When, in the sixties, policy makers felt pressure to equalize access and opportunity for minorities and underpriviledged groups, they

created programs for special help and for bringing community people into the school decisionmaking processes.

Policy makers make policy choices based on their values and their sense of what is possible given political, economic, cultural, and social trends (Garms, Guthrie, & Pierce, 1978; Mitchell, Wirt, & Marshall, 1986). They have the power to allocate values authoritatively. A study of values in state education policy making in six states found that among knowledgeable, influential education policy makers, the dominant value in the early 1980s was quality (Mitchell, Wirt, & Marshall, 1986). Efficiency was the second most pressing value priority, with equity third, and choice last. The important point here is that the equity and the choice that diverse clientele require were given low priority as states fashioned policy for U.S. schools in the 1980's.

Further, the four values are not easily combined and often can be in conflict. Sometimes policy makers devise policies that attempt to pursue all four goals at various stages. For instance, policies might provide for minimum standards for graduation (guaranteeing a quality product), efficient systems (units, hours, tests, etc) for measuring attainment of the quality goal, one or two tracks to achieve the goal (choice) and summer tutoring for the students who fail (equity). Yet, even with such policies, one value (here, quality) dominates, and the other policy provisions are added on as implementation specifics, to placate outsiders who protest the way the dominant value precludes the other three.

The persistent dilemma is that the policies that structure life in schools often pursue one value and ignore the other values. How can schools pursue equity and choice when many people think efficiency and quality are far more important values?

Fundamental Dilemma #2: The Definition of "Quality Education" is Culture Laden

Quality is a culture-specific term. As well-intended teachers, policy makers, and administrators set up procedures to ensure quality education, they set up situations that may conflict with what is "quality" in some cultures.

Where the majority culture retains complete control over the definition of quality, subgroups with different cultural values will not prosper in schools.

When policy makers and educators assume that the dominant culture's view of quality is the one that students must adhere to, for their own good, they may force students to reject elements of their culture, language, and family system. The dilemma remains: how can education systems deal with the inadequate English, different customs, styles of interaction, and attitudes of ethnic minority students and prepare them for jobs and college? How can schools do this without wiping away their heritage or precluding their success?

Fundamental Dilemma #3: Teaching about Equity, Choice, and Diversity Requires Confronting the School's Role in Reproducing the Underclass

American society has always had an underclass of poor and disenfranchised. For curricula to deal honestly with any underclass, there must be some critical analysis of how political, economic, and cultural institutions (including schools) participated in keeping the underclass down. How can schools teach about the underclass without confronting the role that schools play in reproducing the society as it is? And, once it is confronted, how can educators continue to work with such a system? Curricula must go beyond the "Fat Kids that Dance" approach to multicultural understanding with a preponderance of ethnic cooking and dancing (Education

Week, June 22, 1988; Rizvi, 1985). Learning about another cultures or subculture requires more than celebrating and memorizing the names of the heroes, favorite sports, exports, memorable monuments, and geographic features (ee English, this volume).

Fundamental Dilemma #4: Insider and Outsider Pressure are Required to Move a System to Change

How is a system changed? One cannot expect a system with entrenched values, standard operating procedures, and trained professionals who think they've been doing their best for years to analyze itself critically and change its values and practices. Outsiders' pressure, whether it be monitoring by community groups or a federal court, or more subtle incentives (such as grants), are essential for real change in values and procedures.

Simply declaring equity to be a value and making statements that multicultural perspectives will be presented in curriculum, that students will learn to appreciate the heritage of ethnic subgroups, or that administrators will open up access to schools to representatives of minority community groups--will not make these things happen. Such declarations can be merely maneuvers that allow the dominant group to assert that they value diversity and pursue equity goals. It requires vigilance and sophistication for minority groups to pull together political protest and statistical data that challenge the dominants to deliver outcomes, not just statements. Even with accountability and sanctions, substantive change will still not come. The demand for multicultural education may be met with a superficial approach to learning only the food and a few quaint customs of a culture (Risvi, 1985). The demand for promoting women and minorities into school administration may result in their being placed in responsible positions, but still having

inadequate access to the informal training and support that is essential for success (Marshall, 1981; Valverde, 1974). So, how can insiders in the system take on the monitoring, pressuring, and supporting to see that substantive change occurs? These four fundamental dilemmas must be faced.

Two Solutions: Empowering the Challengers and Using Levers to Focus on the Challenges

The Need to Empower the Challengers

Bureaucracy with its assumptions about order, control, hierarchy, efficiency and neutral technical competence, is the grounding theory of our school system (Katz, 1971; Tyack, 1967; Foster, 1986). Therefore the prevailing assumption among educational administrators, policy makers, and professors has been that the job of educational administrators is to maintain equilibrium, control conflict, and work hard at altering procedures so that enough people will believe there is progress going on. The ostensible purpose of educational administration and policy making has been to fix imperfections in the system. Under these assumptions, organizational problems arise from: (a) ignorance or lack of motivation of the populace; (b) ignorance or lack of motivation of public sector professionals and bureaucrats; or, (c) lack of sufficient resources. Therefore, organizations then can supposedly be made effective through adjustment of incentives, resources, and/or staff development and by the development of effective public relations.

Administrators and policymakers work with prevailing assumptions that policies and programs can be devised and implemented to adjust goals and refine the organization to hum smoothly toward meeting its agreed upon goals. Good organizations, it is believed, can work toward achieving social efficiency; schools are for skills training, for developing attitudes favorable to achievement, success, income, and consumption. Bureaucracies can

be made more rational and productive and equitable by policy alterations, increased coordination, special programs. "Liberals argue that there are system imperfections in terms of family and cultural norms that may develop 'culturally deprived' or socially disadvantaged individuals whose deficits may be ameliorated through actions in the public sector, especially education. Liberals expend energy on making the system more meritocratic" (Papagiannis, Klees, & Bickel, 1983, p. 80).

However, there are some who challenge this view. Some see the fundamental dilemmas in theory and practice; they analyze policy alteration and are persistently dissatisfied with the answers, the explanations, the services and the policies that come from those who work under old assumptions. Whether they are scholars, "radical critics," protesters at school board meetings, or disenchanted practitioners silently exiting education, they represent the challenge to educational policy makers. "Business as usual" does not respond to their challenges. Their challenges must be acknowledged. Sharing power with them and eliciting their opinions and analyses must be part of the search for solutions to dilemmas.

The radical critique. The radical critique position is: that throughout the world, poorly educated and cheap labor is quite useful to maintain capitalist profits; that motivation signifies little without empowerment; that there continues to be greater concentration of power and persistent social problems; that the lack of resources devoted to solving social problems represents a political choice (Papagiannis, et al., 1982, see also McClarers, & Giroux, & Jaggar, & Martin, this volume).

Radicals assert that problems are not due to system imperfections, irrationality, and mindlessness, but rather to the fact that the education system functions in the interests of more powerful social classes

(Papagiannis, et al, 1982, see also English, this volume). The beneficiaries of education are the capitalists who perpetuate a social system composed of a docile, fragmented, competing, and powerless working class and of people who have been taught to believe in meritocracy and to strive within the system to move up (Bowles & Gintis, 1976). The education system disseminates this ideology and maintains the myths of meritocracy and democracy while creating and reinforcing different skills and attitudes among different classes of students: rich vs. poor, men vs. women, Black vs. white, and urban vs. rural. The radical emphasis focuses on power and conflict of interests emphasizing how education systems allow and facilitate the accumulation of power for certain groups. The radical critique, then, challenges educational administration to examine its role in the reproduction of inequity and powerlessness, its role as a pawn for capitalism.

The challenge of the underclasses. There are those who dare to declare that the education system a dismal failure; it has merely failed to provide equal access to its benefits. They point to facts that show that education is not pure meritocracy. As Papagiannis et al. (1983) has said, "Blacks and females get lower rewards even after controlling for the influence of irrelevant characteristics.'" Success in educational systems reflects this same race, sex, and class bias . . . and even educational reforms aimed at the disadvantaged often help the advantaged most." (p. 80)

Minorities and other clients with special needs persistently say that education systems don't deliver services equitably. Women are finding it hard to accept that the selection process and the criteria for mobility in school administration result in the mobility of the best qualified candidates. Parents, particularly minority and lower class parents, are not participating in the various structures devised purportedly to increase their access and participation in school functioning (Izu, 1980). There are fundamental

assumptions built into the school system that make people resist, not bother, give up, or laugh at participation. There are people who refuse to believe, cooperate in, or be motivated in, a system that perpetuates something that benefits others but not them. Perhaps they suspect that new programs and policies formulated to better the system actually function to perpetuate the power of authorities, the jobs, and the facade of attainable social efficiency. They know that they will not be the main beneficiaries. They sense that the experts are not solving problems, but are creating diversions and relying on ceremonial gestures to cover over fundamental dilemmas.

Disenchanted professionals. Disenchanted teachers and administrators are abandoning public education. They are people who do not believe that the new program and extra money for low socio-economic status schools will eliminate racism. Disenchanted professionals eschew teaching as a career not just because of low salaries, but because of the loss of legitimacy and authority of expertise.

There are educators and policy makers who find that old solutions no longer work. Much of the thinking and the strategies guiding educational policy and management were developed at a time of growth in the '60s and '70s when one assumed that problems could be solved by increasing budgets. But, as Boyd (1983) points out, "educators are now confronted with four kinds of decline simultaneously--declining enrollments, declining economic-budgetary circumstances, declining public confidence in schooling, and declining legitimacy of administrative authority" (p. 8).

Teachers and administrators find themselves having to ration services, control clientele, manage and limit access to services (Weatherly and Lipskey, 1977). Policy makers' mandates to tighten controls, and to raise teacher competence and student performance require educators to respond to

bureaucratic control. However, educators know that this does not make problems disappear and, instead, exacerbates equity problems. Policy makers and educators cannot hide persistent dilemmas by adding on new programs and new budgets. People see erupting conflicts and persistent dilemmas. Hierarchical control and suppression of conflict does not make dissatisfaction go away and does not increase legitimacy. In a time of decline, old ways of managing dissatisfaction (new incentives, short-term planning, tightened control) are not working. In decline, hard choices must be made about cuts and about equity.

There are clear winners and losers in times of shrinking budgets. Programs for equity and sense of entitlement are threatened in retrenchment. Morale, dependent upon new incentives and a desire to move up in a growing organization, plummets. In times of decline, with no new money or political support for equity, low SES schools are harder hit than affluent ones. With no expansion in opportunity, affirmative action policy (created under assumptions of growth) does not work. Disenchanted professionals watch in frustration as the old system, for which they held high expectations, fails to do that which it promised. Some leave; others lower their commitment.

Politics of education scholars as challengers. Scholars of the politics of education have thrown away the myth of value-free, apolitical education. Decisionmaking and problem solving are a matter of deciding who gets what, when, and how--a political process. Those making decisions for education are not neutral technocrats. Neither elected politicians nor education professionals are value-free. Their values will, naturally, conflict with the values of some minority. Challengers are angered when educators and policy makers act as if education decisionmaking is not a political process. Efforts at reforming education must be viewed in a power, politics and values context. "Ideology, power, and perceived group self-interest . . . (are) key factors

influencing planning and implementation of basic educational reforms" (Paulston, 1978, p. 2).

Education and politics are intertwined, and political values are built into the rules and structures of schools. Decisionmaking structures ensure that certain values will prevail. As Minogue (1983) stated in his critique of the limits of the apolitical model of administration, "Nothing gets done which is unacceptable to dominant influential political groups, which may be defined to include the 'bureaucratic leadership' group" (p. 73). Scholars of the politics of education say openly that superintendents are politicians, that educational administration includes the act of moving people to do what they would not ordinarily do to maintain certain values. Education systems are at the center of fundamental values conflicts, and education includes politics--"the authoritative allocation of values" (Easton, 1953, p. 126).

Activists. Another set of challengers are activists who have observed how, in decisionmaking, certain sets of values and needs are recognized and otners are not. They have seen how value conflicts are played out in budget hearings in state legislatures and how subgroups coalesce, organize into interest groups, and develop strategies so that their needs and values will be incorporated into the curriculum. They look at any arena where values get converted into policy and they examine the macropolitics of school boards, and states legislatures. They also look at the micropolitics, the informal structures for conversion of unstated values into informal policy. These occur in, for example, the "hidden curriculum," which subtly infuses values, the informal selection system in school administration, or the use of professional jargon as a way of presenting an aura of authority and excluding the discourse of those who do not speak with this authority of expertise.

Having seen and participated in politics, activists challenge educational administration to examine and make explicit the ways that formal and informal policies in education differentially affect subgroups.

These challengers--activists, scholars, the underclasses, radical critics' voices are valuable but untapped resources. Empowered and working with educational administrators, they can assist in facing the fundamental dilemmas of schooling. The next section presents tools--levers which will assist in this empowerment and collaborative search.

Levers for Focusing on the Challenges

Why should educational policy makers, from federal and state actors to central office administrators, to site level administrators and teachers, engage with the challengers? Why should they introduce variety and change, open access to community groups, give power to heretofore disenfranchised groups, value cultural variety, and invite critical analysis of the system?

The field of educational policy making will be enlivened by facing fundamental dilemmas that have previously been sidestepped. Policy makers need to face the challenges as they face the limits of traditional models of hierarchical control, manipulation and public relations, and suppression of conflict. The challengers force educational managers and policy makers to focus on fundamental dilemmas and the values conflicts. This section suggests some levers that will help mainstream educational administrators engage with the challengers.

The lever of personal sensitivity. There are times when educators have a gut feeling of discomfort that what they are doing isn't quite right. They sense that the "one best system" (Tyack, 1974) approach is not meeting the needs of a considerable portion of its clientele. They realize that the

system which was created to deal with a certain set of conditions is not capable of working with new conditions that have emerged.

Such apprehensions should be valued as clues revealing those areas where the system is not working well for those who believe in it. The assistant principal facing the complexities of administration, poised on the edge of a promising rise in the organization, feels deep ambivalence concerning aims and goals (Mitchell, 1986; Marshall, 1985a). The teacher in the teachers' lounge, hearing peers discussing the culturally deprived background of several minority students, supresses the urge to rage about self-fulfilling prophecies. Diaries, journals, and group counseling can be methods to tap into these feelings and use them as the basis for systematic observation of the system.

The lever of collaborative research. Teachers feel disenfranchised, excluded from the procedures whereby education system problems are defined and solutions are sought. They resort to political action campaigns to influence the system. Education decisionmakers, distanced from the classrooms and faculty lounges, lack an adequate understanding of teachers problems. They define those problems and identify solutions often with little more than a few phone calls or a survey as their basis for a search for the essence of a problem. Researcners, too, have little influence. If, however, researchers joined forces with practitioners the alliance could produce powerful information about the operation of the social system of schools.

There is history of such alliances. There are examples of ethnographers using teachers as informants (Smith & Geoffrey, 1968), and ethnographers teaming with teachers, using teachers as partners to analyse the data (Mehan, Casden, et al., 1976), and to guide the research (Florio & Walsh, 1978). One stance, developed by Heath (1981), involved training teachers to be ethnographers in their classrooms. Her study of a bi-racial elementary school

and the communities which supplied its students in northern South Carolina showed that black children had difficulty with their teachers' interactional sequences because they were unaccustomed to such interaction in their homes. Teachers evaluated interactional problems in terms of academic achievement so that lack of "proper" interaction became a barrier to learning. Such research discoveries are the sort that would come from collaborative community-researcher study.

Teachers are privy to important information about their own and their students' daily experiences. Their special insights can be tapped from any of these models of collaborative research. Teachers as classroom ethnographers are "isolating, describing, or discovering the dynamics of that environment--what is predictable about how it functions, and what kinds of breakdowns can and do occur," and are "having a new experience in a familiar setting" (Florio & Walsh, 1976, p. 24). They are thereafter more aware, informed, able to articulate the practitioners' insights, and able to participate in problem finding. They are also more able to devise solutions, to test hypotheses about what would improve practice and they are more likely to participate effectively in policy making for their school (Kyle & Hovda, 1988).

Similarly, parents, community groups, principals, school janitors, community service people, and the like would make excellent collaborators in research concerning questions of school-community relations, and school site-district office linkages. Even superintendents and school board members would be fine collaborators in qualitative research identifying problems in state policy intent and implementation. (Collaborative research is closely connected to participatory research, as explained in Hall, 1984.)

A major difference between ordinary research and collaborative research is that the collaboration creates an <u>alliance</u> of people committed to making

the research findings noticed and incorporated in policy alterations. Their research would be of the sort of in-depth description that enhances the likelihood of discovering alterable variables that policy makers need (Marshall, 1985b).

Qualitative research. Where there are persistent conflicts and evidence of ineffectiveness in schools, a first step should be exploratory research. Qualitative research allows educators and researchers to explore, to go beyond the limits of a narrow, problem-oriented approach; it facilitates a search for the subjective interpretation of events by the participants in the setting--the "emic" view (Spradley, 1979; Marshall, 1985c). It is the sort of research that would ask, for example, what is happening in the implementation of special programs for involving minorities and would purposefully seek the participants' language and meaning-making. It allows discovery of informal and unstructured linkages and processes in organizations and real, as opposed to stated goals and procedures. It is the only way to conduct research that can go beyond the limits of traditional organization theory which "limits us to the examination of measurable facts of organization and the manifest behavior of organizational actors" (Angus, 1984, p. 12). Accepting such limitations, researchers will "implicitly endorse the social conditions which have created those facts and those behaviors. The supposedly objective analyst becomes a political actor, working on behalf of the status quo" (Denhardt, 1981, p. 633). However, qualitative research, using the constant comparative method espoused by Glaser & Strauss (1967) and employed by critical ethnographers, means "generating and plausibly suggesting . . . many categories, properties, and hypotheses" about this "general problem" rather than a concern only for causal properties. (p. 104). Figure 1 outlines the very different goals, assumptions, and outcomes of qualitative research and research within the traditional frame. A traditional frame assumes that

research is done to find ways to fix the existing system and maintain a stable system and to create a consensus around manageable issues. But qualitative research searches for a widened reality, for alternative perspectives. It does not allow avoidance of dilemmas and does not stay within limits of the existing system.

(Insert Figure 1 about here)

Qualitative research allowed Ogbu (1974) to uncover the ways in which minority citizens' access to schools was stilted by the views of education professionals. His study of school failures of minority groups in a Mexican-American and black neighborhood showed that the student-teacher relationship was "characterized by social distance, mutual stereotyping, and lack of effective communication" and that such a relationship "contributes to maintain the school-failure adaptation." (p. 159, 160) His research approaches searched for the processes by which certain subgroups are continuously excluded from the benefits of organizations.

Because qualitative research is open to competing paradigms and theroretical frameworks, it allows us to go beyond extant knowledge and to use cross-cultural perspectives. It allows us to understand better the functions of organizational rituals and ceremonies and the process of meaning- and consensus-making in organizations, including the focus on the process by which some people's ideas and needs are excluded from the process.

Qualitative research allows us to uncover the underlying processes which have resulted in loss of legitimacy, resources, and morale in public education. For example, demographic research shows that a large portion of Hispanics prefer to send their children to parochial school, and, indeed, the children perform better there than in public schools (McKenna & Ortiz, 1988). Research that delves into the family traditions, the values, the self-

perceived needs of these Hispanic families is required before there can be any viable public policy and educational administration that meets the needs of this large minority in the U.S. public schools. Similarly, sinking morale, job burnout, and lagging recruitment in the teacher work force will not be cured by any state policies which fail to address the real problems of the people living and working their daily lives in schools.

Qualitative research can be designed to capture the lives and words of the underclass, the hidden informal structured connections among organizations, the informal policies and the unanticipated outcomes of policies and programs. But if the researcher enters this underclass with assumptions and categories already in place, the discovery process will be thwarted. As an example, Whyte (1967) in Streetcorner Society, started his exploration of Italian immigrants' community by walking down the street and labelling the homes as "dilapidated." He soon discovered that what looked dilapidated to a Harvard graduate student was a source of pride to an Italian family. He learned to discover their meaning-making. Qualitative research, which uncovers the values, needs, and aspirations of subgroups and underrepresented minorities is essential before effective policy can be articulated to achieve equity.

Two subcategories of qualitative research are language analysis and analysis of stories--are particularly exciting as levers for understanding cultural assumptions and values in school systems.

Language analysis can be used to choose valid interpretations, to examine thought as it is mirrored in language. Linguistic structures are seen as keys to people's cognitive structures, a way to "discover a set of categories subjects themselves use--to characterize significant findings, as well as a means to explicate the specialized meanings particiants attributed to the

terms they used (Donmoyer, 1984, p. 25-26, see also Purcell-Gates, & Salinger, this volume).

Ethnographic research to understand context can be combined with content analysis of the words of dominant policy actors to uncover assumptions of what is important and what is assumed in policy choices. Researchers like Sproull (1977) and Murphy (1980) have used analysis of words to uncover the thought processes and constraints on decisionmaking of educational administrators and policy makers. Pfeffer (1981) likewise notes that "power is enacted through language. Although language serves descriptive purposes, it does more . . . it also shapes the meaning and interpretations attached to those events and behaviors." In the policy culture, where values and assumptions are contested, power will determine which group's definition of the emergent order prevails (Rossman, Firestone, & Corbett, 1984). As Rossman, et al., (1984) observed "how people talk about themselves, others, and their work provides some cues to themselves and others about appropriate roles, socially acceptable behaviors, and acceptable reasons for those behaviors. In addition, language forces attention to certain information by making that information salient" (p. 14).

In order to understand how policy is made, we need to tap into the policy actors' stories and examine how the dominant story maintains a model of the world. Policy cultures socialize members to common understandings about who is powerful, what is valuable, what are the proper behaviors, and so on (Marshall, Mitchell, & Wirt, 1986). Participant observation and analysis of words provide scenarios and examples that reveal the assumptions that are guiding policy actors. Stories are exhibitions of values and assumptions. As Burlingame (1983) said:

> Stories . . . tell us who our friends or enemies are . . . who supports or opposes our interests, and how power is distributed in our society.

The story both creates and displays a universe of 'facts' and 'values'. (p. 6)

Thus, the various forms of qualitative research that allow the exploration of fundamental dilemmas and values conflicts.

Search-widening methods and critical analysis. Reform requires a broadened analysis of systems. Good decisionmaking can occur only after a wide search identifies the needs and concerns of all the people who will be affected by a decision.

What would happen if administrators learned, through the training and selection of administrators, that it was a good thing to act slowly and deliberately, searching widely among a variety of options? This would be far more useful for long term planning for curriculum, for coordinating the services and resources, and for identifying ways to use the schools to achieve equity; further, it might eliminate many of the crises that require quick action. Administrators' training for this would be enhanced by skills in critical policy analysis, implementation analyses, and values clarification.

Critical policy analysis, the searching for the socio-political, historical and economic assumptions of any policy proposal, will be an important tool for examining the effects of policy in muticultural society. Rizvi, a proponent of critical policy analysis, argued the "policies can only be understood in the specific historical and cultural contexts in which they are explored and made. An analysis which overlooks the importance of this historical specificity is thus misconceived . . . . Policies are administrative allocation of values, given legitimacy and authority in particular cultural context" (Rizvi, 1985, p. 3). "This . . . draws our attention to the centrality of power and control in the concept of policy and

requires us to consider not only whose values are represented in policy but also how these values have become institutionalized" (Prunty, 1984, p. 42).

Rizvi (1985) continues:

> The task of a policy analyst is to not only identify those values and interests which are served by the promotion of a particular policy but also to describe the political mechanisms which are used to legitimate these values and explain how various structures and procedures are manifestations of that policy." (p. 3)

Traditional policy analysis involves attempts to explain the causes and consequences of policy options, with an empirical examination of policy issues with the tools of systematic inquiry. It is "an effort to develop and test general propositions about the cause and consequences of public policy" (Dye, 1981, p. 7). It assumes that facts and values are separable.

Critical policy analysis differs. It searches for and evaluates the values-assumptions in policy proposals, and can be the basis for open debate about political and moral issues. As Rizvi (1985) explains:

> A particular policy can be judged rationally to be, for example, exploitative or repressive, if the values which it manifests, both in how it is articulated and practiced, conflict with the moral vision which is constitutive of that norm of life. A policy which might claim to promote human emancipation, but helps erect either overtly or covertly, bureaucratic structures and procedures that inhibit democratic participation can thus be critized on the grounds of normative incoherence. Similarly, a policy which leads to human misery and a sense of powerlessness and alienation, and can be criticized on moral grounds for it conflicts with principles,

possibly asserted elsewhere, of human welfare and justice. (p. 5-6)

Thus, critical policy analysis shows that policy formulation, legitimization, implementation, analysis, and evaluation are value-laden. There is no value-free analysis. Hidden agendas and unspoken structural assumptions eventually reveal themselves. An understanding of the historical circumstances and the dynamic nature of policy development enables the critical policy analyst to evoke the cultural values promoted by any policy. Policy can be seen as the output of cultural politics, in that different groups have struggled to have <u>their</u> values and their constructions of reality implemented in societal institutions (Bates, 1986).

Critical policy analysis, then, holds promise for identifying the cultural assumptions in the elements of school structures constituted by past policy and in current and future proposals.

<u>Implementation analysis</u> goes beyond analysis of policy formulation. It examines the values conflicts and fundamental dilemmas which emerge as a policy or program is implemented through the various layers of education systems. Each of the individuals and bureaus in those layers have their motives and biases that enter as they translate policy into regulations, interpret vague areas, and mete out resources. Implementation analysis asks such questions as:

1. Is there a match between the ideology expressed in the policy and the procedures for implementation? (For example, when a policy expresses the intended purpose of opening access of previously uninvolved citizens into the needs assessment and decisionmaking arenas for public schools, but a regulation that requires strict accounting of numbers and vital statistics of the participants prevents illegal aliens from participating.)

2. Does the policy conflict with entrenched program goals? If so, what happens? (Sometimes a policy for raising educational quality, for example, minimimum competency testing undermines the viability of a developing program for preventing high school dropout.)

3. How does the policy affect the bureaus that implement it? (Sometimes control or a budget, staff and status for implementing a policy are impetus enough to make a bureau continue an otherwise defunct policy.)

4. Does the policy conflict with local organizational needs? If so, what happens? (A policy mandating multicultural lessons across the curriculum may interfere with ongoing local efforts to raise scores on achievement tests.)

Implementation analysis should track actors' perception and reactions to a policy--their decisions to participate or not to participate in a program, and their efforts to have their interests reflected in the decision outcome (Bacharach & Mitchell, 1985). It should also track the perceptions and reactions of those who never participate.

Skills in values clarification and analysis of values-conflicts in policy issues can be levers for improving educational management and policy making. Policy actors know that they make such decisions on values, but they usually work out compromises and covers so that the values conflicts do not show through. At all levels, policy actors are making decisions about directions for bilingual education, standardized testing, homogeneous grouping, school boundaries according to residential zones (with residential segregation), selection processes for school administrators, allowing parents open access to schools, the social studies and cross-cultural curriculum, and the strategies for assisting unsuccessful students. But policy actors may not see how certification barriers filter out minorities, how homogenous grouping may lead to ethnic and racial segregation. They may not raise questions about the

appropriateness of standardized testing for diverse populations, the sorting function in schooling from kindergarten's groupings to senior high tracks. If they see these values-conflicts, they know to avoid them.

In one study on values in state education policy making, policy actors became very uncomfortable with making explicit values commitments (Mitchell, Wirt, & Marshall, 1986). A data collection instrument that forced policy actors to, on paper, place an "X" along a scale where policy issues with different values were placed in opposition to each other. Policy actors resisted making explicit values choices. For example, policy actors have made deals to increase the level of funding for schools while, at the same time their policy created greater inequity among school districts. They know that a policy that improves the use of education's top dollars will reduce flexibility and choice, but they also know to avoid those values-conflicts. But, avoiding the values conflicting does not make them disappear. Administrators are often creating or implementing policies with inherent values conflicts. Skills in analysis of values would be useful tools.

Administrators need skills for examining a policy in its formulation and its implementation, to identify the main value being pursued and to search for its effect on the system's ability to pursue the other values. Once the values are identified, then policy makers should carefully and explicitly examine how choice and equity values are affected by the policy.

Summary and Implications

Educational administrators as well as policy makers at all levels are facing strong challenges from people who see the system's failure to change and to provide equity. Their old ways of coping will not work. Merely fine-tuning the system and sidestepping values-conflicts has dysfunctional outcomes (including disenfranchised, disenchanted community members, decline in morale

of the educator work force, lack of excitement and achievement in classrooms, and loss of legitimacy of the education system).

There are persistent challengers to the field who can assist in a lively search for ways to gain legitimacy, integrity, and support for the education system, and who can help educators confront the fundamental dilemmas in education systems and undo dysfunctional patterns. The challengers--scholars, activists, disenchanted practitioners, and outsiders--call attention to the values conflicts that educational administrators and policy makers too often avoid. If the managers and policy makers merely pull together good defenses and quick fixes in response to the critical dilemmas posed by the challengers, they will miss the chance to identify dilemmas and seek solutions with the assistance of the challengers. However, as Bates (1986) has said, "If appropriate means are developed which allow cultural politics to be articulated in a way which can imaginatively transform current practices, then administration is likely to develop on a collaborative (dare we say democratic?) basis" (p. 32). The challengers can help (or force) those who make policy and who manage education to transform current practices; and levers, like critical policy analysis, collaborative research and others outlined, will enable a constructive transformation.

References

Angus, L. (1984). Ethnography and organizational analysis in research in education in A.A.R.E. Research and Education Futures: Technology, Development and Educational Futures. Perth, Australia.

Bacharach, S. B., & Mitchell, D. (1985). The generation of practical theory: Schools as political organizations. In J. Lorsch (Ed.). Handbook of organizational behavior. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Barnhart, R. (1986). Administration across cultures. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Bates, R. (1986). The culture of administration, the processes of schooling and the politics of culture. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Blietz, J., & Courtnage, L. (1980). Inservice training for regular educators: A requisite for main-streaming the handicapped. Teacher Education and Special Education, 3(4), 10-18.

Bowles, S., & Gintis, H. (1976). Schooling in capitalist America: Education reform and the contradiction of economic life. New York: Basic Books.

Boyd, W. L. (1983). Political science and educational administration: Rethinking educational policy and management in the 1980s. Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Burlingame, M. (1983). Stories and local level politics and education. Unpublished manuscript, University Press.

Cline, R. (1981). Principal's attitudes and knowledge about handicapped children. Exceptional Children, 48(2), 172-174.

Denhardt, R. (1981). In the shadow of organization. Lawrence: Regents Press.

Donmoyer, R. (1984, April). Cognitive anthropolicy and research on effective principals: Findings from a study and reflections on its methods. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

Dye, T. R. (1981). Understanding public policy. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Easton, D. (1953). The political system. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Fleming, T. (1988, March). In the imperial age and after: Patterns of British Columbia school leadership and the instruction of the superintendency, 1984-1988.

Florio, S., & Walsh, M. (1978). The teacher as colleague in classroom research. (Occasional Paper No. 4) East Lansing, MI: The Institute for Research on Teaching.

Foster, W. (1986). Paradigms and promises: New approaches to educational administration. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

Garms, W., Guthrie, J., & Pierce, L. (1978). School finance: The economics and politics of education. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Glaser, B., & Strauss, A. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine.

Gronn, P. (1983). Rethinking educational administration: T.B. Greenfield and his critics. Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Habermas, J. (1976). Legitimation crisis, London: Hineman Educational Books.

Hall, B. L. (1984). Research, commitment and action: The role of participatory research. International Review of Education, 30(3), 289-300.

Heath, S. B. (1981). Ethnography in education: Toward defining the essentials. In P. Gilmore, & A. Glatthorn (Eds.). Ethnography and education: Children in and out of schools. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Izu, J. (1980). Myths and realities of policy implementation: The case of California's School Improvement Program. Unpublished working paper, Stanford University.

Katz, M. B. (1971). Class, bureaucracy, and schools: The illusion of educational change in America. New York: Praeger Publishers.

Kyle, D., & Hovda, R. (1988). Action research. Peabody Journal of Education, Vol. 64, No. 1 & 2 (in press).

Marshall, C. (1981). Organizational policy and women's socialization in administration. Urban Education, 16(2), 205-231.

Marshall, C. (1985a). Facing fundamental dilemmas in education systems. Education and Urban Society, 18(1), 131-134.

Marshall, C. (1985b, April). Field studies and educational administration and policy: The fit, the challenge, the benefits, and costs. Urban Education, 20(1), 61-81.

Marshall, C. (1985c). Appropriate criteria of trustworthiness and goodness for qualitative research on education organizations. Quality and Quantity, 19, 353-373.

Mehan, H., Casden, C., Coles, L., Fisher, S., & Maroules, N. (1976). Social organization of classroom lessons. (Report No. 67-68). San Diego: University of California Center for Human Information Processing Reports.

McKenna, T., & Ortiz, F. I. (1988). The broken web: The educational experiences of Hispanic American women. Claremont, CA: The Thomas Rivera Center.

Minogue, M. (1983). Theory and practice in public policy and administration. Policy and Politics, II(1), 63-85.

Mitchell, D., Wirt, F., & Marshall, C. (1986, October). Alternative state policy mechanisms for pursuing educational quality, equity, efficiency, and choice goals. Final report to the National Institute of Education.

Mitchell, B. A. (1986). Gender issues in the assistant principalship. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Unviersity of Pennsylvania, Philadelpnia.

Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (Eds.) (1987). Approaches to administrative training in education. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Murphy, J. T. (1980, July-August). The state role in education: Past research and future directions. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 24(4), 39-51.

Ogbu, J. (174). The next generation: An ethnography of education in an urban neighborhood. New York: Academic Press.

Olson, L. (1988, June 22). The unbalanced equation. Education Week, 7(39), 19.

The National Commission in Excellence in Educational Administration.

Ortiz, F. I., & Marshall, C. (1988). Women in educational administration. In Norman J. Boyan (Ed.), Handbook of research on educational administration (pp. 123-142). New York: Longman.

Papagiannis, G. L., Klees, S., & Bickel, R. (1983). Toward a political economy of educational innovation. In W. L. Boyd (Ed.), Political science and educational administration (pp. 74-17). Victoria, Australia: Deakin University Press.

Paulston, R. G. (1978). Changing educational systems: A review of theory and experience. Washington, DC: Development Economics Department, World Bank.

Pfeffer, J. (1981). Management as symbolic action. In L. L. Cummings, & B. M. Staw (Eds.). Research in organizational behavior (pp. 1-52). JAI Press.

Prunty, J. J. (1984). A critical reformulation of educational policy analysis. Victoria, Australia: Deakin University.

Risvi, F. A. (1985). Multiculturalism and Beyond: A critical policy analysis. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Rossman, G., Firestone, W., & Corbett, H. D. (1984, November). Plan for the study of professional cultures in improving high schools. Unpublished paper. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better Schools.

Sadker, M., & Sadker, D. (1988, April). An empirical approach to restructuring schools for an equitable society: Implications for researchers. Presentation at the annual conference of the American Educational Research Association (AERA). New Orleans.

Sarason, S. (1982). The culture of the school and the problem of change (2nd ed). Boston: Alloyn & Bacon.

Smith, L. M., & Geoffrey, W. (1968). The complexities of an urban classroom. New York: Holt Rinehart & Winston.

Spradley, J. P. (1979). The ethnographic interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Sproull, L. (1977). Managerial attention in new educational programs: A micro-behavioral study of program implementation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA.

Tyack, D. B. (1974). The one best system: A history of American urban education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Valverde, L. (1974). Succession socialization: Its influence on school administrative candidates and its implications to the exclusion of minorities from administration. Washington, DC: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 093 052).

Weatherly, R., & Lipsky, M. (197). Street-level bureaucrats and educational innovation. Harvard Educational Review, 47, 171-197.

Whyte, W. F. (1967). Street corner society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Wise, A. E. (1979). Legislated learning: The bureaucratization of the American classroom. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Wolcott, H. (1973). The man in the principal's office. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Figure 1

The Contrasting Perspectives of the Qualitative and the Traditional Approaches

	Qualitative Paradigm	Traditional Paradigm in Education Management and Policy
Purpose	Exploration for meaning. Interpretive, multi-perspective. (Humanism)	Hierarchical control. Following chain of command. (Mechanism)
Institutional Base	University scholars--search for understanding the nature of the world.	Bureaucracy/administration/ policy. Myth of the apolitical nature of education. Seeing schools as factories.
Focus of Practice & Research	Ethics - conflicts. Values - conflicts. Viewing politics as the "Authoritative allocation of values." Search for variety of perspectives.	Control of discussion and decisionmaking. Confining issues to policy agendas. Research questions derived from old knowledge and traditional ways of thinking.
Outcomes/ Results in Research	Findings devoid of final answers, but based in a widened reality. Findings with no single best answer.	Partisan research and partisan training. Cost benefit analysis. Rational model evaluation. Neat and clear answers, with clear cause and effect linkages.
Outcomes in Practice	Forces values clarification and debate over ethical choices.	Reifies system by allowing small adjustments and by avoiding examination of fundamental dilemmas.
Outcomes in Decision Making	Forces people to exercise free will and take responsibility for their choices, many of which are moral choices.	Allows obfuscation--hiding behind the authority of partisan research.
Policy Outcomes	Negotiable tactics and strategies. Reopenable decisions.	Laws and regulations.